



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/749,282

12/31/2003

Frederick R. Ernest

25389A

9791

22889

7590

10/30/2007

OWENS CORNING
2790 COLUMBUS ROAD
GRANVILLE, OH 43023

EXAMINER

KATCHEVES, BASIL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3633

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/749,282	Applicant(s) ERNEST ET AL.	
	Examiner Basil Katcheves	Art Unit 3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 14-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant has amended the claims in the amendment dated 8/15/07.

Claims 8-13 are withdrawn, claims 1-7 and 14-20 are pending and examined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,354,057 to Ploplis in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,910,280 to Robbins, III as in the previous action.

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 7, Ploplis teaches a corner finishing trim having first and second thermoplastic pieces (Figure 11), the first and second polymer pieces are then shown in Figure 1 to be welded together (column 6, line 65) to form an angle. The polymer pieces can be made from polyvinyl chloride (PVC) (column 1, line 12). It should be noted that claim 7 is considered a product-by-process claim, therefore, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. See MPEP 2 113. The patentability of the product does not depend on its method of production. If the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the same prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Since Ploplis teaches pieces welded together, it is considered to read on the claims. Ploplis does not disclose the molding trim as having flanges for slidably engaging adjacent pieces. Robbins discloses corner

molding (figs. 8 & 9) having flanges (36 & 38) slidably engaged to adjacent pieces. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ploplis by adding the engaging means disclosed by Robbins, in order to better secure the molding pieces together.

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ploplis ('057) in view of Robbins III ('280) further in view of Enlow et al. (US Pat.Publication 2002/0157772) as in the previous action.

Regarding claims 2-5, Ploplis in view of Robbins teaches an assembly as stated above, but does not include a laminate of foil, UV protective wood grain foil, or white foil. Enlow teaches that it is known in the art to provide a protective and decorative surface film of various laminates on polymeric (PVC and others) materials and panels. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a coating of laminate to a trim panel or assembly in various decorative colors or wood grains, as a matter of design choice. Often the trim in homes is white or wood grain, so this would allow for a material that has strength, is resistant to water and sunlight, and eliminates the need for painting or staining.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,910,280 to Robbins III.

Regarding claim 14, Robbins discloses a corner trim molding (figs. 8 & 9) comprising separate pieces, lapped (see overlapped portions 36 & 38) made of

an extruded polymer (column 1, line 68 – column 2, line 14), the pieces having friction fit flanges (figs. 8 & 9: 36 & 38) for slidably receiving adjacent pieces.

Applicant should note that even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production, in this case, extrusion. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.

Robbins does not disclose a concave shape in the molding. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to change the shape of the molding to concave in the Robbins patent because a change in shape is within the level of ordinary skill in the art absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration is significant (see MPEP 2144.04 (IV) (B)). In this case, the molding is ornamental and most any design shape is purely aesthetic.

Claims 15-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,910,280 to Robbins III in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0157772 to Enlow as in the previous action.

Robbins discloses a corner assembly as stated above, but does not include a laminate of foil, UV protective wood grain foil, or white foil. Enlow teaches that it is known in the art to provide a protective and decorative surface film of various laminates on polymeric (PVC and others) materials and panels. It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a coating of

lamine to a trim panel or assembly in various decorative colors or wood grains, as a matter of design choice. Most often the trim found in peoples homes or offices is white or wood grain, so this would allow for a material that has strength, is resistant to water and sunlight, and eliminates the need for painting or staining.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,910,280 to Robbins III as in the previous action.

Regarding claim 19, Robbins discloses the use of any suitable polymeric material which may be thermoplastic or thermosetting (column 2, lines 10-15). Therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use one of the polymer materials such as specified in these claims.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,910,280 to Robbins III in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,354,057 to Ploplis as in the previous action.

Regarding claim 20, Robbins does not disclose the use of welding the tri pieces together. Ploplis discloses the use of welding trim pieces. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify Robbins by using welds, as disclosed by Ploplis, in order to create a water tight connection between members.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/15/07 have been considered but are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Ploplis does not teaching welding the plastic pieces. The applicant also states that Ploplis discloses welding single pieces and that it is not obvious to weld two pieces. The applicant should note that Ploplis discloses the use of welding when assembling plastic trim pieces and therefor, is construed as being an obvious means to connect the pieces. This is an obviousness rejection. The applicant argues the combination of Ploplis and Robbins. The applicant argues this on the basis of their functions, As Robbins is intended to be used as a boat bumper. However, the applicant should note that Robbins is used as a trim piece or molding piece as Ploplis and therefore may be combined together. The applicant argues the thickness of the Robbins patent as making it not usable in a combined manner with Ploplis. The applicant should note that it is not being combined because of its thickness, it is combined for the reasons cited above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (571) 272-6846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot, can be reached at (571) 272-6777.

BK


Basil Katcheves

10/26/07

Primary Examiner AU 3633